

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 15 are pending in the present Application. In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Khan in view of Nielsen.

Examiner Tran is greatly thanked for the telephone interview of March 26, 2008. In that telephone interview the Examiner pointed to a plurality of applications that were concurrently filed with the present one (i.e., Applications serial nos. 09/998,391 (abandoned), 09/997,960 (on appeal) and 09/997,915 (on appeal)) and which have a common specification as a source of limitations that can be further added to the claims.

Following Examiner Tran's suggestion, the independent claims have been amended to include some of the limitations in the abandoned case. Note that by the amendment of the claims no new matter is added to the Application since support for the added limitations can be found on page 13, lines 12 – 30.

For the reasons stated more fully below, Applicants submit that the claims are allowable over the applied references. Hence, reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

The invention is set forth in claims of varying scopes of which Claim 1 is illustrative.

1. A computer implemented method of ***highlighting Web pages arranged in categories on a server*** comprising:
 - using a keyword or a phrase to search Web pages bookmarked in two or more sub-folders;***
 - creating a sub-folder into which all Web pages searched that contain the keyword or phrase are to be stored;***
 - storing bookmarks to all the Web pages that contain the keyword or phrase into the created sub-folder;***

comparing the bookmarked Web pages in the created sub-folder to the Web pages in the categories; and

highlighting all the Web pages in the categories that are the same as the bookmarked Web pages. (Emphasis added.)

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner admitted that Khan does not teach a method of highlighting Web pages arranged in categories on a server by highlighting all the Web pages in the categories that are the same as the bookmarked Web pages; but stated that Nielsen teaches such a method and concluded that it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Khan with those of Nielsen. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Nielsen purports to teach a method for providing to a user of a hypertext system an enhanced history presentation that allows the user to more quickly find and reference previously viewed hypernodes. According to Nielsen, a history list is used in Web browsers to provide a mechanism by which a user can recall hypernodes (i.e., Web pages) that have been previously accessed by the user. However, the history list can become quite long. A long history list that accumulates over an extended period of time becomes difficult for a user to access because of the shear amount of material provided to the user. Further, the history list is preferably used to refer to recently accessed hypernodes. Thus, the user has difficulty when scanning a long intermixed list of recently accessed and aged hypernodes to determine which hypernode is the one of interest. Consequently, Nielsen provides a method of indicating the order in which a user accessed a plurality of hypernodes in a history list by linking a first Web page accessed before a second Web page to the second Web page.

Further, Nielsen provides a method of presenting aggregate information of a plurality of Web pages to a user. When a user accesses a plurality of Web pages in a Web site, an aggregate reference information is gathered in the history facility. The aggregate information is obtained by truncating the hyperlink reference of each accessed Web page. The truncated hyperlink references of

AUS920011027US1

the Web pages are compared together. Matched truncated hyperlink references are combined to form a hyperlink aggregate. This hyperlink aggregate also has aggregate information. The aggregate information is what is presented to the user in the history list in place of the information for each one of the Web pages.

As an example, if a user accesses two Web pages during the course of browsing the Internet (i.e., **ibm.com/software** and an **ibm.com/hardware**), the two Web pages will be truncated to **ibm.com/** (i.e., the Web site of IBM). The title of the Web site will be used in the history list. This title will contain (aggregate) information regarding both Web pages that were accessed. The user may have the information of the truncated Web pages display by expanding the aggregate information.

However, Nielsen does not teach, show or so much as suggest the step of **highlighting all the Web pages in the categories that are the same as the bookmarked Web pages** as in the claimed invention.

Consequently, assuming arguendo that Khan teaches what the Examiner asserted that it teaches, combining the teachings of Khan with those of Nielsen does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Further, note that neither Khan nor Nielsen teaches or suggests using a keyword or a phrase to search Web pages bookmarked in two or more sub-folders; creating a sub-folder into which all Web pages searched that contain the keyword or phrase are to be stored; storing bookmarks to all the Web pages that contain the keyword or phrase into the created sub-folder

Hence, Applicants submit that the claims are patentable over the cited references and respectfully request reconsideration, allowance and passage to issue of the claims in the Application.

AUS920011027US1

Appl. No. 09/998,392
Amdt. dated 04/09/2008
Reply to Office Action of 01/09/2008

Respectfully Submitted

By:

Votel Jamile
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,969
(312) 306-7969

AUS920011027US1